REMARKS

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the notice that claim 3 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

As a preliminary matter, it appears that the office action does not provide a rejection for Applicant's claims and as such, these claims are in condition for allowance. For example, there does not appear to be a rejection set forth for claim 12 and other claims. As such, if the claims are not allowed in view of the below remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that a non-final action must be issued since Applicant has not had an opportunity to respond to a rejection of claims.

Claim 1 is objected to due to a typographical error. This typographical error has been corrected.

Claims 1-7, 2-17, 19-21, 24-33, 35 and 37-46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph as allegedly being indefinite to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claim 15 has been corrected. These claims are objected to since the term "signed certificate set" can be alleged to be interpreted to be a set of signed certificates or a set of certificates that is signed. In the "Response to Arguments" section, the office action appears to misapprehend the teachings of the specification. As Applicant previously noted, the term "signed certificate set" includes a set of certificate related data that is signed. As noted in claim 1, the certificate data includes at least the unique identifier and the public key of each of the plurality of trusted certificate issuing units. This set of information is digitally signed. Also, the description in the specification relating to signed certificate sets does not indicate that no entries are included in this term as used in the claim. The claim requires that

the certificate issuing units are trusted by an anchor certificate issuing unit. The cited portion of page 12, lines 18-19 describes a condition where the units are not trusted. In any event, the claims have been amended to address the office action's comments.

Claims 16-17, 19-21, 24-29 and 38-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection as it does not appear to be appropriate in view of Patent Office guidelines and since there is no basis for the rejection. For example, claim 16 is directed to "an apparatus" and is not directed to software, per se. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 12-17, 19-21, 24-33, 35, 37-38, 40-41, 43 and 45-46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,304,974 to Samar in view of Menezes. Samar is directed to a method and apparatus for managing trusted certificates that assembles a list of trusted certificates containing public keys for authenticating communications signed by associated private keys. A client verifies that a fingerprint received through a second communication mechanism was constructed from the list of trusted certificates received through the first communication mechanism. An enterprise administrator includes its own certificate along with the other trusted certificates in the list. Once the user verifies the fingerprint and installs the list, subsequent updates to the list do not require further out-of-band verification of the fingerprint and the enterprise administrator's public key is used to verify any updated list. The office action cites column 6, lines 14-21 and lines 28-34 as allegedly teaching collecting at least one cross certificate and obtaining a certificate issuing unit public key and associated unique identifier for a cross certified certificate issuing unit identified by the at least one cross certificate. However, Applicant is unable to find any mention of a cross certificate in the cited

portion. As such, the reasons for rejecting the claim do not appear to be taught in the reference and as such, the claim is in condition for allowance.

In addition, the office action admits that Samar fails to teach, among other things, collecting cross certificates and creating a signed certificate set that identifies a plurality of certificate issuing units determined to be trusted by the anchor certificate issuing unit based on the at least one cross certificate. The office action cites to Menezes and the definition of cross certificate of page 572 thereof. The office action then states "therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Samar to collect the enterprise administrator's cross certificates to build the list of trusted CAs." Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching of enterprise administrator cross certificates in Samar or Menezes and no motivation provided by the mere definition of a cross certificate. In fact, the cited portions of Menezes and Samar are both silent as to how to use cross certificates in a signed set as claimed and neither reference, alone or in combination, describes creating a signed certificate set identifying a plurality of certificate issuing units determined to be trusted by an anchor certificate issuing unit based on at least one cross certificate associated with the anchor certificate issuing unit wherein the signed certificate set includes a digital signature. For example, Menezes does not appear to teach in the cited portion any mechanism for using a cross certificate but merely defines what one is which is known in the art. The motivation alleged appears to be a restatement of the definition of a cross certificate.

The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Applicant respectfully submits that this claim and the other claims are allowable for the reasons given above and also respectfully submits that Samar does not teach, among other things, creating a plurality of signed certificate sets on a per-anchor certificate issuing unit basis since if

it is alleged that the enterprise administrator is an anchor certificate issuing unit there is only one enterprise administrator described since it accommodates the operation for the system. Moreover, the enterprise administrator does not appear to be an anchor certificate issuing unit since it does not appear to issue certificates but instead accesses certificate issuing authorities. Accordingly, the claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. The other dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Applicant respectfully petitions the Patent Office for the requisite extension of time if necessary. The Patent Office is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 22-0259 for any extension fees or additional fees required, or credit any overpayments to this account. Applicants have enclosed a duplicate copy of this paper.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/7/06

By: _____
Christopher J. Reckamp
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.
222 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60601
Phone: (312) 609-7599
Fax: (312) 609-5005
Email: creckamp@vedderprice.com